

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 have been pending in the application.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 18 is amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Whitman et al. (6,772,150).

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitman et al. (6,772,150).

The claims are amended and cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice. Reconsideration of the claims is requested. No new matter has been added.

35 USC 102 REJECTION

Applicant traverses the Office Action rejection rationale in the Response to Arguments as follows:

Response #1, #2 and #3

The Office Action asserts that Whitman reads data from RAM, which is allegedly similar to the claimed “extracting.” Further, the Office Action asserts Whitman’s display of hyperlink and readable text based upon a search is allegedly inherently similar to the claimed “transforming said data of said documents ...” Further, the Office Action alleges clicking on a hyperlink is allegedly similar to the claimed “second display form.”

To establish a prima facie case of anticipation, Whitman must disclose either expressly or inherently each claimed element.

The language of claim 1 does not only recite “transforming said data of said documents,” but the language of claim 1 specifies that there is a transformation of data “corresponding to said selected display item into information to indicate said data of said documents to said user in said second display form.” In other words, there is a “transforming ... in a first display form” and “select a display item ... as a second search condition ... receiving designation of a second display form ... and transforming ... said selected display item ... in said second display form.”

Whitman does not expressly disclose these features, because even if assuming Whitman's hyperlink and readable text could correspond to the first display form, clicking on the hyperlink is not the same as the language of claims "select a display item ... as a second search condition." In other words, the click of the hyper link does not refer to designation of "a second display form" in relation to "selected display item ... as a second search condition," because the click of the hyper link merely designates changing display of same data, namely expand. In claim 1, the data change is instructed by a selection of the display item in the first display form "as a second search condition," and the second display form is in relation to the selected display item utilized as a second search condition. The language of claim 1 also provides "to select a display item ... as a search condition ... said display item generated from said data of said plurality of documents extracted ... extracting data of documents corresponding to said display item selected by said user ... " For example, FIG. 9 (data selected from region 415) and page 14, line 2+ (e.g., 19-27) support the claims.

Further, no evidence has been cited or found in Whitman that Whitman's search engine result inherently or necessarily requires the claimed "transforming ... in a first display form" and "select a display item ... as a second search condition ... receiving designation of a second display form ... and transforming ... said selected display item ... in said second display form," because Whitman is silent on any type of "second search condition," and is not necessarily required for Whitman's search engine to perform another search based upon a second search condition and to display the result in "second display form." Further, applicants note the language of claim 1 provides "receiving designation of a second display form ... different from said first display form" and in relation to "a second search condition." Even if assuming the Office Action interpreting Whitman's suggested search terms to be similar to the claimed "second search condition," Whitman fails to expressly or inherently disclose the claimed "designation of a second display form ... different from said display form" in relation to the "second search condition," because Whitman would display the second search condition in a first display form, namely the alleged hyperlink.

A prima facie case of anticipation cannot be established based upon Whitman. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1 (and 16 and 18 which require features similar to claim 1) is requested.

Response #4

The Office Action response is directed to dependent claim 3. Dependent claim 3 indicates “dividing said plurality of documents into clusters.” Said “plurality of documents” are extracted based upon the searching in claim 1. On the other hand, 810 of Fig. 8 indicates **related search phrases**, which were extracted from history of search queries submitted to a search engine by a community of users. See col. 3 lines 40-42. That is, 810 of Fig. 8 merely indicates search phrases in the previous search queries, and does not indicate any list of documents. Therefore, “Related Searches 810” does not indicate a cluster within said extracted plurality of documents. In other words, a benefit of the embodiments is to extract a plurality of documents as a subset of all documents, and then further cluster the subset of documents.

In addition, “Full Results 820” in Whitman includes all retrieved documents. On the other hand, in claim 3, said plurality of documents also refers to all of the retrieved documents. Therefore, “Full Results” in Whitman apparently corresponds to “said plurality of documents” in claim 3. Therefore, “Full Results 820” is not any cluster within “said plurality of documents.”

Accordingly, the Office Action rationale is inconsistent.

Allowance of dependent claim 3 is requested.

Response #5

The Office Action response is directed to dependent claims 2 and 6. The language of claim 6 provides “information to ***display ... a segment*** that ***connects*** between said used words and represents the calculated degree of relevancy between said used words.” The Office Action relies upon a hyper link. However, the hyper link merely connects two objects logically. On the other hand, “segment” refers to “the part of a line between two points” as described in Longman Advanced American Dictionary. Namely, the claimed segment is a physical line between two points, namely the language of claim 2 provides “***display ... a segment*** that ***connects*** between said used words.” In addition, in claim 6, the language of claim provides that the segment “represents the calculated degree of relevancy between said used words.” However, the hyper link cannot represent any calculated degree of relevancy.

Further, the Examiner comments “But the citation does not explain why Whitman does not obtain segment.” It is readily apparent that Whitman does not expressly disclose the claimed “***display a segment*** that ***connects***.” So the Examiner appears to rely upon inherency.

However, Whitman merely indicates hyper links, which do not necessarily require “display a segment that connects,” providing a benefit of a physical displayed structure connecting the documents by physical lines on a screen (for example, Figs. 15-17 in this application).

Further, the language of claim 2 provides “a second form ***showing indications*** of said extracted documents, and ***segments between the indications***, each said ***segment representing a degree of relevancy between said extracted documents***, that is calculated by used words in said extracted documents.”

Accordingly, dependent claims 2 and 6 are allowable.

Claims 20 and 22:

Amended claim 20 is allowable, because it clarifies “enabling the user to select the transformed information in the user designated display form as a search result condition as a following search condition; and outputting a ~~transformed~~ search result of the following search condition.”

Amended claim 22 is allowable, because it clarifies:

first searching a database using a first search condition entered by user and displaying a first search result of the searching using a first display form;

enabling the user to select a displayed item from the search result as a second search condition and to select a second display form;

second searching the database and/or the search result using the second search condition; and

displaying a second search result of the second searching in the second display form.

A prima facie case of anticipation based upon Whitman cannot be established, because nothing has been cited or found in Whitman that expressly or inherently (by necessarily requiring) discloses the claimed “**enabling the user to select a displayed item from the search result as a second search condition and to select a second display form.**”

For example, FIG. 9 and page 14, lines 2+ (e.g., 19-27) support the claims.

Allowance of claim 22 is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ September 29, 2008 _____ By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501